

## BellSouth Florida OSS Testing Evaluation

Date: August 28, 2001

#### **EXCEPTION REPORT**

KPMG Consulting has identified an exception as a result of the POP Volume Performance Test (TVV-2).

#### **Exception:**

KPMG Consulting has not received timely responses for the pre-order queries, Appointment Availability (AAQ), Address Validation (AVQ), Address Validation by Telephone Number (AVQ\_TN), Customer Service Record (CSRQ), Service Availability (SAQ) and Telephone Number Assignment (TNAQ) submitted via the Robust Telecommunications Access Gateway (RoboTAG) Web interface. (TVV2)

#### Background:

According to Operations Support Systems OSS-1 of the Service Quality Measurement Plan<sup>1</sup>, BellSouth should return pre-order responses within an average interval that is at parity +2 seconds with retail performance provided monthly by BellSouth. KPMG Consulting used BellSouth parity metrics for the report period of June 1, 2001 through June 30, 2001<sup>2</sup>.

#### Issue:

During volume testing conducted on August 16, KPMG Consulting received the following results for AAQ, AVQ, AVQ\_TN, CSRQ, SAQ and TNAQ pre-orders, submitted using RoboTAG:

	<2.3 Seconds	>6 Seconds	<=6.3 Seconds	Average Response Time
AAQ - KPMG Consulting				
Performance	44.71%	54.68%	45.32%	21.1 Seconds
BellSouth Parity	98.24%	0.64%	99.39%	0.69 Seconds
AVQ - KPMG Consulting Performance	0%	96.97%	3.03%	54.7 Seconds
BellSouth Parity	96.16%	0.71%	99.33%	1.04 Seconds
AVQ_TN - KPMG Consulting	0%	100%	0%	53.4 Seconds

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> BellSouth OSS Testing Florida Interim Performance Metrics Version 3.0, Approved by Florida PSC June 12, 2001

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Pre-Ordering and Ordering OSS



## BellSouth Florida OSS Testing Evaluation

Performance				
BellSouth Parity	97.37%	0.48%	99.55%	0.92 Seconds
CSRQ - KPMG Consulting				
Performance	0%	99.58%	0.42%	66.5 Seconds
BellSouth Parity	93.36%	1.60%	98.46%	1.66 Seconds
SAQ - KPMG Consulting Performance	0%	100%	0%	196.1 Seconds
BellSouth Parity	77.21%	4.92%	95.47%	2.09 Seconds
TNAQ - KPMG Consulting				
Performance	12.30%	79.67%	20.33%	26.9 Seconds
BellSouth Parity	95.50%	2.22%	97.85%	3.12 Seconds

## Impact:

Delays in receiving pre-order responses could prevent a CLEC from obtaining information necessary to efficiently process a customer's service request. As a result, customer satisfaction with the CLEC could decrease.



Florida OSS Test Exception #104

Date: September 17, 2001

#### EXCEPTION REPORT

KPMG Consulting has identified an exception as a result of the POP Volume Performance Test (TVV-2).

#### **Exception:**

KPMG Consulting has not received timely responses for the pre-order queries, Appointment Availability (AAQ), Address Validation (AVQ), Address Validation by Telephone Number (AVQ\_TN), Customer Service Record (CSRQ), Service Availability (SAQ) and Telephone Number Assignment (TNAQ) submitted via the Robust Telecommunications Access Gateway (RoboTAG) Web interface. (TVV2)

#### Background:

According to Operations Support Systems OSS-1 of the Service Quality Measurement Plan<sup>1</sup>, BellSouth should return pre-order responses within an average interval that is at parity +2 seconds with retail performance provided monthly by BellSouth. KPMG Consulting used BellSouth parity metrics for the report period of June 1, 2001 through June 30, 2001<sup>2</sup>.

#### Issue:

During volume testing conducted on August 16, KPMG Consulting received the following results for AAQ, AVQ, AVQ\_TN, CSRQ, SAQ and TNAQ pre-orders, submitted using RoboTAG:

	<2.3 Seconds	>6 Seconds	<=6.3 Seconds	Average Response Time
AAQ - KPMG Consulting Performance	44.71%	54.68%	45.32%	21.1 Seconds
BellSouth Parity	98.24%	0.64%	99.39%	0.69 Seconds
			in Particologi	Application of the Control of the Co
AVQ - KPMG Consulting Performance	0%	96.97%	3.03%	54.7 Seconds
BellSouth Parity	96.16%	0.71%	99.33%	1.04 Seconds
AVQ_TN - KPMG Consulting		100%	0%	53.4 Seconds

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> BellSouth OSS Testing Florida Interim Performance Metrics Version 3.0, Approved by Florida PSC June 12, 2001

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Pre-Ordering and Ordering OSS

Performance				
BellSouth Parity	97.37%	0.48%	99.55%	0.92 Seconds
CSRQ - KPMG Consulting Performance	0%	99.58%	0.42%	66.5 Seconds
BellSouth Parity	93.36%	1.60%	98.46%	1.66 Seconds
			SETPINA L	
SAQ - KPMG Consulting Performance	0%	100%	0%	196.1 Seconds
BellSouth Parity	77.21%	4.92%	95.47%	2.09 Seconds
TNAQ - KPMG Consulting Performance	12.30%	79.67%	20.33%	26.9 Seconds
BellSouth Parity	95.50%	2.22%	97.85%	3.12 Seconds

#### Impact:

Delays in receiving pre-order responses could prevent a CLEC from obtaining information necessary to efficiently process a customer's service request. As a result, customer satisfaction with the CLEC could decrease.

#### **BellSouth Response:**

BellSouth disagrees with KPMG's findings and the measurement results stated for the pre-order queries submitted using RoboTAG. BellSouth's results are included in the table below:

Pre Order Queries	KPMG's Average Response Time	BellSouth's Average Response Time
Appointment Availability Query – (AAQ)	21.1 Seconds	1.29 Seconds
Address Validation Query – (AVQ)	54.7 Seconds	1.38 Seconds
Address Validation by Telephone Number (AVQ TN)	53.4 Seconds	1.19 Seconds
Customer Service Records Query – (CSRQ)	66.5 Seconds	2.45 Seconds
Service Availability Query - SAQ	194/1 Seconds	1.33 Seconds
Telephone Number Assignment Query – (TNAQ)	26.9 Seconds	1.50 Seconds

These BellSouth response time measures are taken from TAG server logs. The timestamps used in the calculation (T1 & T4) represent the round trip processing time on the TAG server, in backend communications and in backend application processing. Since RoboTAG currently reacquires TAG security credentials for each transaction, the KPMG measures could differ by as much as three seconds to account for security server

processing time. The remaining discrepancies are most likely a result of resource contention within the RoboTAG application side as a result of severely overloading the volume capacity of a single RoboTAG implementation.

RoboTAG was designed for the service ordering needs of a small to medium sized individual CLECs rather than for the ordering volume of the entire BST region of RoboTAG CLECs.

The RoboTAG platform is set up with relatively inexpensive hardware and software that operates over a LAN-to-LAN connection or the Internet. The Internet capability was included as a way for CLECs to save money on communications costs, but has the inherent disadvantage of providing relatively slow communications. The Windows NT environment was selected over UNIX for RoboTAG processing because it was adequate for the transaction volumes of the CLEC community that it was designed to support, and the cost were more attractive to the smaller CLECs.

KPMG processed 9641 Pre-Order transactions during their one-day test on 8/16/01. That represents approximately one month's transactions from the largest CLEC that uses RoboTAG. It appears that almost half of the transactions were processed using the Internet.

The BST support staff interacts frequently with the RoboTAG user community and reports that these CLECs do not experience the delayed response times cited by KPMG.

The processing of a larger volume of transactions than the system was designed to support will create slower processing and this is explained to all CLECs before purchasing the RoboTAG product.

BellSouth proposes a collaborative effort between BellSouth and KPMG to analyze testing results on a real time basis as a means of determining the source of the discrepancies in response time measurements.



## BellSouth Florida OSS Testing Evaluation

Date: August 29, 2001

#### **EXCEPTION REPORT**

KPMG Consulting has identified an exception as a result of the POP Functional Evaluation (TVV-1). This exception includes information originally published in Observation 55 and Observation 65.

#### **Exception:**

KPMG Consulting has not received responses to several Local Service Requests (LSRs) using the Electronic Data Interchange (EDI) interface. (TVV1)

#### Background:

CLEC's send service requests to BellSouth via EDI. In response to a service request submitted via EDI, BellSouth first sends an Acknowledgment and then a subsequent response of an Error/Reject/Clarification or a Firm Order Confirmation (FOC).

The following PONs, originally cited by Observation 55 and Observation 65, were submitted using the EDI interface but have received neither rejects nor confirmations from BellSouth.

PON	VER	CC I	Ack Received
002071FPEN004001	00	9990	4/4/01 2:57 PM
011071FPEJ000001	00	9993	3/15/01 11:01 AM
011071FPEJ000001	01	9993	3/29/01 8:15 AM
011071FPEJ000003	00	9993	3/28/01 11:49 AM
011071FPEJ000003	01	9993	4/3/01 6:12 PM
011071FPEJ000003	02	9993	4/10/01 3:12 PM
011071FPEJ001002	00	9993	4/3/01 7:58 PM
011091FPEJ000001	00	9993	3/27/01 4:31 PM
011091FPEJ000001	01	9993	4/3/01 2:03 PM
011091FPEJ000001	02	9993	4/3/01 6:44 PM



## BellSouth Florida OSS Testing Evaluation

PON	VER	CC	Ack Received
011091FPEJ000001	03	9993	4/10/01 3:34 PM
012031FPEJ000004	03	9993	4/10/01 11:33 AM
070032FPEF000001	01	9990	3/26/01 5:52 PM
002131FPEJ100002	01	9990	3/29/2001 8:15
002141FPEJ000002	01	9990	3/16/2001 10:53
006031FPEJ000001	02	9990	4/3/2001 14:08
006031FPEJ000002	02	9990	4/3/2001 14:13
007061FPEJ100002	00	9990	3/15/2001 11:01
010051FPEJ100001	00	9993	3/15/2001 11:01
010051FPEJ100001	01	9993	3/29/2001 8:15
010061FPEJ100001	01	9993	3/16/2001 14:05
010151FPEJ100002	01	9993	3/16/2001 13:16
011021FPEN000001	01	9993	3/26/2001 16:07
011021FPEN001001	02	9993	4/3/2001 12:00
011032FPEN100001	01	9993	3/16/2001 9:52
012031FPEJ000004	02	9993	3/26/2001 14:19
012031FPEJ001001	02	9993	4/3/2001 14:19
020031FPEN100001	01	9990	3/28/2001 11:49
072141FPEH001001	02	9993	4/4/2001 18:07
074021FPEH000007	04	9993	4/4/2001 18:21
070051FPEH000003	00	9990	3/15/01 11:04
010051FPEJ100001	00	9993	3/15/01 11:01

KPMG Consulting, Inc. 08/29/01 Page 2 of 8



## **EXCEPTION 105**BellSouth Florida OSS Testing Evaluation

PON	VER	CC	Ack Received
011071FPEJ000002	01	9993	3/26/01 15:39
010032FPEN100001	02	9993	3/20/01 17:27
011032FPEN100001	02	9993	3/22/01 15:38
071061FPEI000001	01	7125	3/16/01 10:48
088011FPEH000001	02	9993	3/20/01 13:36
020021FPEN102002	00	9990	3/22/01 14:25

**Issue:** KPMG Consulting continues to experience response failures on orders submitted through the EDI interface.

KPMG Consulting has not received Acknowledgments to service requests. The following communication log between KPMG Consulting and BellSouth's EC Support details EDI defects affecting the failure:

PON	VER	CC	Date Sent	Status per PON- Report	BellSouth EC Support Discovery (Ticket 56199)
011081FPEJ002001	00	9993	06/20/0 1 14:40		Clarification document was not generated due to an EDI defect. When multiple files came to the Mercator translator at virtually the same time, Mercator would assign the same Thread ID to each file. Once one of the files was processed, the other file with the same Thread ID was dropped as that Thread ID was marked as complete. This was a Mercator software defect; the fix was developed by the parent company, sent to the EDI group, and implemented the evening of 7/19/01.
012031FPEJ000003	00	9993	06/20/0	In Clarification	Clarification document was not



## BellSouth Florida OSS Testing Evaluation

TO US THE BASS	Lat. 1741 Professional Confession	Baltin rayer that a categoria na	Personal responsibility of the second second	A SECTION OF THE PROPERTY OF T
VER	CC	Date Sent	Status per PON Report	BellSouth EC Support Discovery (Ticket 56199)
		1 13:11	06/21/01 11:56	generated due to an EDI defect. When multiple files came to the Mercator translator at virtually the same time, Mercator would assign the same Thread ID to each file. Once one of the files was processed, the other file with the same Thread ID was dropped as that Thread ID was marked as complete. This was a Mercator software defect; the fix was developed by the parent company, sent to the EDI group, and implemented the evening of 7/19/01.
00				No FOC was prepared/translated for VER 00.
00		06/21/0	Pointed 06/21/01	Reject document was not generated due to an EDI defect. When multiple files came to the Mercator translator at virtually the same time, Mercator would assign the same Thread ID to each file. Once one of the files was processed, the other file with the same Thread ID was dropped as that Thread ID was marked as complete. This was a Mercator software defect; the fix was developed by the parent company, sent
	9993		•	to the EDI group, and implemented the evening of 7/19/01.
	00	00 9993	VER         CC         Sent           1 13:11         06/22/0           00         9993         1 07:25	VER   CC   Sent   Report

The PONs listed below were transmitted to BellSouth via EDI and also failed to receive an Acknowledgment:

PON	VER	i cc	Date Sent
072011FPEF100016	00	9990	6/20/01 9:29
011121FPEN110003	01	9993	6/21/01 14:29

KPMG Consulting, Inc. 08/29/01 Page 4 of 8



## BellSouth Florida OSS Testing Evaluation

PON	VER	CC	Date Sent
054031FPEN001006	00	9993	6/22/01 11:21
015052FPEJ004001	00	9993	6/28/01 12:25
071051FPEI001007	00	7125	6/29/01 11:55
071051FPEI001008	00	7050	6/29/01 11:55
071051FPEI002002	00	7050	6/29/01 11:55
085011FPEH000009	02	9993	7/17/01 17:04
085011FPEH001001	02	9993	7/17/01 17:04

Additionally, KPMG Consulting continues to experience failure of a subsequent response, Error/Reject/Clarification or a Firm Order Confirmation after receipts of a Functional Acknowledgement.

The following communication log between KPMG Consulting and BellSouth's EC support detail EDI defects and the associated PON/Vers sent by KPMG Consulting that did not receive a subsequent response after receipt of an Acknowledgment:

		100	100	
PON	VER	CC	Date Sent	BellSouth EC Support Discovery (Ticket 56199)
072131FPEH000003	00	9993	06/18/01	A defect in a downstream system is preventing a response document from being generated when a reject condition is encountered. Scheduled fixed on 07/27/01.
072131FPEH000004	00	9993	06/18/01	A defect in a downstream system is preventing a response document from being generated when a reject condition is encountered. Scheduled fix on 07/27/01.
072131FPEH000005	00	9993	06/19/01	A defect in a downstream system is preventing a response document from being generated when a reject condition is encountered. Scheduled fix on 07/27/01.
072131FPEH000006		9993		A defect in a downstream system is preventing a response document from being generated when a reject condition is

KPMG Consulting, Inc. 08/29/01 Page 5 of 8



## BellSouth Florida OSS Testing Evaluation

		Comments of the comments of th	Date	
PON	VER 00	CC	Sent	BellSouth EC Support Discovery (Ticket 56199) encountered. Scheduled fixed on 07/27/01.
072131FPEH000008	00	9993		A defect in a downstream system is preventing a response document from being generated when a reject condition is encountered. Scheduled fixed on 07/27/01.
072141FPEH003001	00	9993	06/13/01	Clarification document was not generated due to an EDI defect. When multiple files came to the Mercator translator at virtually the same time, Mercator would assign the same Thread ID to each file. Once one of the files was processed, the other file with the same Thread ID was dropped as that Thread ID was marked as complete. This was a Mercator software defect; the fix was developed by the parent company, sent to the EDI group, and implemented the evening of 7/19/01.
072141FPEH003001	00	9993		A defect in a downstream system is preventing a response document from being generated when a reject condition is encountered. Scheduled fix on 07/27/01.
084021FPEH000002	00	9993	06/7/01	Response transaction failed EDI translation due to a downstream defect where the ISA-PARTNER-ID was omitted. Scheduled fix on 6/22.
084021FPEH000002	00	9993	06/21/01	A defect in a downstream system is preventing a response document from being generated when a reject condition is encountered. Scheduled fixed on 07/27/01.

The PON/Vers listed below were submitted to BellSouth via the EDI interface and also failed to receive a subsequent response after receipt of an Acknowledgement:

PON	VER	CC	Date Sent
002141FPEJ001006	00	9990	5/15/2001 11:36
002141FPEJ002006	00	9990	5/15/2001 11:40
010011FPEN101003	00	9993	5/15/2001 11:44

KPMG Consulting, Inc. 08/29/01 Page 6 of 8



## BellSouth Florida OSS Testing Evaluation

PON	VER	CC	Date Sent
002201FPEJ101003	00	9990	5/15/2001 11:52
007061FPEJ102002	00	9990	5/15/2001 16:32
007061FPEJ102003	00	9991	5/15/2001 16:32
017031FPEN000002	00	9993	5/16/2001 9:17
084021FPEH002001	00	9993	5/24/2001 14:03
084011FPEH000004	00	9993	5/25/2001 11:57
084011FPEH000005	00	9993	5/25/2001 12:06
087041FPEH004001	00	9993	6/4/2001 18:33
072011FPEH102001	00	9990	6/18/2001 14:26
054031FPEN000004	00	9993	6/21/2001 11:48
075012FPEF001002	00	9990	6/25/2001 11:15
074052FPEH001002	02	9993	6/25/2001 17:23
011071FPEJ000009	00	9993	6/27/2001 9:24
068021FPEI001001	00	7125	6/27/2001 10:01
068021FPEI000004	00	7125	6/27/2001 10:25
068021FPEI000005	00	7125	6/27/2001 10:29
072141FPEH000002	00	9993	6/27/2001 11:09
074021FPEF001002	01	9990	6/27/2001 11:17
084021FPEH000003	00	9993	6/27/2001 18:01
087041FPEH000005	00	9993	7/3/2001 12:16
093022FPEF001003	00	9990	7/12/2001 14:15

KPMG Consulting, Inc. 08/29/01 Page 7 of 8



## BellSouth Florida OSS Testing Evaluation

PON	VER	CC	Date Sent
085011FPEH000009	03	9993	7/18/2001 11:29
072141FPEH000002	01	9993	7/19/2001 10:47

#### Impact:

Failure to respond to service requests via EDI could impact CLECs in the following ways:

- Decrease in Customer Satisfaction. CLECs might experience unnecessary delays due to their inability to determine the status of their service requests. A delay in delivering a service to a customer may negatively impact a customer's perception of a CLEC's service quality.
- Increase in Operating Costs. Researching problem resolutions may require additional CLEC resources before successfully processing individual customer orders.



Florida OSS Test Exception #105

Date: September 21, 2001

#### **EXCEPTION REPORT**

KPMG Consulting has identified an exception as a result of the POP Functional Evaluation (TVV-1). This exception includes information originally published in Observation 55 and Observation 65.

#### **Exception:**

KPMG Consulting has not received responses to several Local Service Requests (LSRs) using the Electronic Data Interchange (EDI) interface. (TVV1)

#### **Background:**

CLEC's send service requests to BellSouth via EDI. In response to a service request submitted via EDI, BellSouth first sends an Acknowledgment and then a subsequent response of an Error/Reject/Clarification or a Firm Order Confirmation (FOC).

The following PONs, originally cited by Observation 55 and Observation 65, were submitted using the EDI interface but have received neither rejects nor confirmations from BellSouth.

PON	VER	CC	Ack Received	BellSouth Response
002071FPEN004001	00	-	PM	As reported in Observation 65, the response document was part of EDI interchange that failed due to X12 translation error. The EDI delimiter was changed from an asterisk to a hex character on 4/10/01, correcting the problem.
011071FPEJ000001	00		3/15/01 11:01 AM	As reported in Observation 65, the response document was part of EDI interchange that failed due to X12 translation error. The EDI delimiter was changed from an asterisk to a hex character on 4/10/01, correcting the problem.

PON	VER	CC	Ack Received	BellSouth Response
011071FPEJ000001	01	1	3/29/01 8:1 AM	5As reported in Observation 65, the response document was part of EDI interchange that failed due to X12 translation error. The EDI delimiter was changed from an asterisk to a hex character on 4/10/01, correcting the problem.
011071FPEJ000003	00		3/28/01 11:4 AM	9As reported in Observation 65, the response document was part of EDI interchange that failed due to X12 translation error. The EDI delimiter was changed from an asterisk to a hex character on 4/10/01, correcting the problem.
011071FPEJ000003	01		4/3/01 6:1 PM	2As reported in Observation 65, the response document was part of EDI interchange that failed due to X12 translation error. The EDI delimiter was changed from an asterisk to a hex character on 4/10/01, correcting the problem.
011071FPEJ000003	02		4/10/01 3:1 PM	2As reported in Observation 65, the response document was part of EDI interchange that failed due to X12 translation error. The EDI delimiter was changed from an asterisk to a hex character on 4/10/01, correcting the problem.
011071FPEJ001002	00		4/3/01 7:5 PM	8As reported in Observation 65, the response document was part of EDI interchange that failed due to X12 translation error. The EDI delimiter was changed from an asterisk to a hex character on 4/10/01, correcting the problem.
011091FPEJ000001	00		3/27/01 4:3 PM	l As reported in Observation 65, the response document was part of EDI interchange that failed due to X12 translation error. The EDI delimiter was changed from an asterisk to a hex character on 4/10/01, correcting the problem.

PON	VER	CC	Ack Received	BellSouth Response
011091FPEJ000001	01		4/3/01 2:03 PM	As reported in Observation 65, the response document was part of EDI interchange that failed due to X12 translation error. The EDI delimiter was changed from an asterisk to a hex character on 4/10/01, correcting the problem.
011091FPEJ000001	02		4/3/01 6:44 PM	As reported in Observation 65, the response document was part of EDI interchange that failed due to X12 translation error. The EDI delimiter was changed from an asterisk to a hex character on 4/10/01, correcting the problem.
011091FPEJ000001	03		4/10/01 3:34 PM	As reported in Observation 65, the response document was part of EDI interchange that failed due to X12 translation error. The EDI delimiter was changed from an asterisk to a hex character on 4/10/01, correcting the problem.
012031FPEJ000004	03		4/10/01 11:33 AM	As reported in Observation 65, the response document was part of EDI interchange that failed due to X12 translation error. The EDI delimiter was changed from an asterisk to a hex character on 4/10/01, correcting the problem.
070032FPEF000001	01		3/26/01 5:52 PM	As reported in Observation 65, the 860 document was received and translated in EDI, but was not uploaded to LEO due to 860 EDI CONNECT:Direct upload problem. This problem was resolved on 03/26/01.
002131FPEJ100002	01		3/29/2001 8:15	As reported in Observation 65, the response document was part of EDI interchange that failed due to X12 translation error. The EDI delimiter was changed from an asterisk to a hex character on 4/10/01, correcting the problem.

PON	VER	CC	Ack Received	BellSouth Response
002141FPEJ000002	01	9990	3/16/2001 10:53	As reported in Observation 65, the response document was part of EDI interchange that failed due to X12 translation error. The EDI delimiter was changed from an asterisk to a hex character on 4/10/01, correcting the problem.
006031FPEJ000001	02	9990	4/3/2001 14:08	As reported in Observation 65, the response document was part of EDI interchange that failed due to X12 translation error. The EDI delimiter was changed from an asterisk to a hex character on 4/10/01, correcting the problem.
006031FPEJ000002	02	9990	4/3/2001 14:13	As reported in Observation 65, the response document was part of EDI interchange that failed due to X12 translation error. The EDI delimiter was changed from an asterisk to a hex character on 4/10/01, correcting the problem.
007061FPEJ100002	00	9990	3/15/2001 11:01	As reported in Observation 65, the response document was part of EDI interchange that failed due to X12 translation error. The EDI delimiter was changed from an asterisk to a hex character on 4/10/01, correcting the problem.
010051FPEJ100001	00	9993	3/15/2001 11:01	As reported in Observation 65, the response document was part of EDI interchange that failed due to X12 translation error. The EDI delimiter was changed from an asterisk to a hex character on 4/10/01, correcting the problem.
010051FPEJ100001	01	l	3/29/2001 8:15	As reported in Observation 65, the response document was part of EDI interchange that failed due to X12 translation error. The EDI delimiter was changed from an asterisk to a hex character on 4/10/01, correcting the problem.

PON	VER	CC	Ack Received	BellSouth Response
010061FPEJ100001	01	1	3/16/2001 14:05	As reported in Observation 65, the response document was part of EDI interchange that failed due to X12 translation error. The EDI delimiter was changed from an asterisk to a hex character on 4/10/01, correcting the problem.
010151FPEJ100002	01	l	3/16/2001 13:16	As reported in Observation 65, the response document was part of EDI interchange that failed due to X12 translation error. The EDI delimiter was changed from an asterisk to a hex character on 4/10/01, correcting the problem.
011021FPEN000001	01		3/26/2001 16:07	As reported in Observation 65, the 860 document was received and translated in EDI, but was not uploaded to LEO due to 860 EDI CONNECT:Direct upload problem. This problem was resolved on 03/26/01.
011021FPEN001001	02		4/3/2001 12:00	As reported in Observation 65, the response document was part of EDI interchange that failed due to X12 translation error. The EDI delimiter was changed from an asterisk to a hex character on 4/10/01, correcting the problem.
011032FPEN100001	01	1	3/16/2001 9:52	As reported in Observation 65, the response document was part of EDI interchange that failed due to X12 translation error. The EDI delimiter was changed from an asterisk to a hex character on 4/10/01, correcting the problem.
012031FPEJ000004	02		3/26/2001 14:19	As reported in Observation 65, the response document was part of EDI interchange that failed due to X12 translation error. The EDI delimiter was changed from an asterisk to a hex character on 4/10/01, correcting the problem.

PON	VER	CC	Ack Received	BellSouth Response
012031FPEJ001001	02	9993	4/3/2001 14:19	As reported in Observation 65, the response document was part of EDI interchange that failed due to X12 translation error. The EDI delimiter was changed from an asterisk to a hex character on 4/10/01, correcting the problem.
020031FPEN100001	01	9990	3/28/2001 11:49	As reported in Observation 65, the response document was part of EDI interchange that failed due to X12 translation error. The EDI delimiter was changed from an asterisk to a hex character on 4/10/01, correcting the problem.
072141FPEH001001	02	9993	4/4/2001 18:07	As reported in Observation 65, the response document was part of EDI interchange that failed due to X12 translation error. The EDI delimiter was changed from an asterisk to a hex character on 4/10/01, correcting the problem.
074021FPEH000007	04		4/4/2001 18:21	As reported in Observation 65, the response document was part of EDI interchange that failed due to X12 translation error. The EDI delimiter was changed from an asterisk to a hex character on 4/10/01, correcting the problem.
070051FPEH000003	00	9990	3/15/01 11:04	As reported in Observation 55, the response document was part of EDI interchange that failed due to X12 translation error. The EDI delimiter was changed from an asterisk to a hex character on 4/10/01, correcting the problem.
010051FPEJ100001	00	9993		As reported in Observation 55, the response document was part of EDI interchange that failed due to X12 translation error. The EDI delimiter was changed from an asterisk to a hex character on 4/10/01, correcting the problem.

PON	VER	CC	Ack Received	BellSouth Response
011071FPEJ000002	01	9993	3/26/01 15:39	As reported in Observation 55, the 860 document was received and translated in EDI, but was not uploaded to LEO due to 860 EDI CONNECT:Direct upload problem. This problem was resolved on 03/26/01.
010032FPEN100001	02	9993	3/20/01 17:27	As reported in Observation 55, the 860 document was received and translated in EDI, but was not uploaded to LEO due to 860 EDI CONNECT:Direct upload problem. This problem was resolved on 03/26/01.
011032FPEN100001	02	9993	3/22/01 15:38	As reported in Observation 55, the 860 document was received and translated in EDI, but was not uploaded to LEO due to 860 EDI CONNECT:Direct upload problem. This problem was resolved on 03/26/01.
071061FPEI000001	01	7125	3/16/01 10:48	As reported in Observation 55, the response document was part of EDI interchange that failed due to X12 translation error. The EDI delimiter was changed from an asterisk to a hex character on 4/10/01, correcting the problem.
088011FPEH000001	02	9993	3/20/01 13:36	As reported in Observation 55, the 860 document was received and translated in EDI, but was not uploaded to LEO due to 860 EDI CONNECT:Direct upload problem. This problem was resolved on 03/26/01.
020021FPEN102002	00	9990		As reported in Observation 55, there was a failure between EDI and LEO. EDI has record of translating and passing this PON on 3/22 at 1:24 PM. LEO has no record in their database.

**Issue:** KPMG Consulting continues to experience response failures on orders submitted through the EDI interface.

KPMG Consulting has not received Acknowledgments to service requests. The following communication log between KPMG Consulting and BellSouth's EC Support details EDI defects affecting the failure:

PON	VER	СС	Date Sent	Status per PON Report	BellSouth EC Support Discovery (Ticket 56199)	BellSouth Findings
011081FPEJ002001	00	9993	06/20/01 14:40	In Clarification 06/21/01 13:57	Clarification document was not generated due to an EDI defect. When multiple files came to the Mercator translator at virtually the same time, Mercator would assign the same Thread ID to each file. Once one of the files was processed, the other file with the same Thread ID was dropped as that Thread ID was marked as complete. This was a Mercator software defect; the fix was developed by the parent company, sent to the EDI group, and implemented the evening of 7/19/01.	The information in the column to the left is as reported by EDI on EC Support Ticket 56199.  The FA for this PON/VER could have been impacted by the Mercator translator Thread ID problem. There is no audit trail to conclusively identify this FA as being impacted because FAs (997s) are not identified by PON numbers. The Mercator translator Thread ID defect was corrected on 7/19/01.
012031FPEJ000003	00	9993	06/20/01 13:11	In Clarification 06/21/01 11:56	company, sent to the EDI group, and implemented the evening of 7/19/01.	The information in the column to the left is as reported by EDI on EC Support Ticket 56199.  The FA for this PON/VER could have been impacted by the Mercator translator Thread ID problem. There is no audit trail to conclusively identify this FA as being impacted because FAs (997s) are not identified by PON numbers. The Mercator translator Thread ID defect was corrected on 7/19/01.

PON	VER	СС	Date Sent	Status per PON Report	BellSouth EC Support Discovery (Ticket 56199)	BellSouth Findings
080012FPEH001005	00	ı		FOC Sent 06/25/01 16:44 CQ4JF6P6 06/29/2001		The information in the column to the left is as reported by EDI on EC Support Ticket 56199.  BellSouth EDI records show that the FA for the first occurrence of this PON/VER was sent to KPMG on 06-20-01 at 14:52:52.  The FA for the 2 <sup>nd</sup> instance of this PON/VER (6-20-01 at 15:40) could have been impacted by the Mercator translator Thread ID problem. There is no audit trail to conclusively identify this FA as being impacted because FAs (997s) are not identified by PON numbers.
011121FPEN100004	00	9993		Rejected 06/21/01 11:55	generated due to an EDI defect. When multiple files came to the Mercator translator at virtually the same time, Mercator would assign the same Thread ID to each file. Once one of the files was processed, the other file	This is as reported by EDI on EC Support Ticket 56199.  Disagree. BellSouth EDI records show that the FA for this PON/VER was sent to KPMG on 06-21-01 at 11:53.

The PONs listed below were transmitted to BellSouth via EDI and also failed to receive an Acknowledgment:

PON	VER	CC	Date Sent	BellSouth Findings
072011FPEF100016	00	9990	6/20/01 9:29	Inbound 850 document was not translated due to an EDI defect. When multiple files came to the Mercator translator at virtually the same time, Mercator would assign the same Thread ID to each file. Once one of the files was processed, the other file with the same Thread ID was dropped as that Thread ID was marked as complete. This was a Mercator software defect; the fix was developed by the parent company, sent to the EDI group, and implemented the evening of 7/19/01.
011121FPEN110003	01	9993	6/21/01 14:29	Inbound 860 document was not translated due to an EDI defect. When multiple files came to the Mercator translator at virtually the same time, Mercator would assign the same Thread ID to each file. Once one of the files was processed, the other file with the same Thread ID was dropped as that Thread ID was marked as complete. This was a Mercator software defect; the fix was developed by the parent company, sent to the EDI group, and implemented the evening of 7/19/01.
054031FPEN001006	00	9993	6/22/01 11:21	Disagree. This PON/VER was not received in EDI.
015052FPEJ004001	00	1	6/28/01 12:25	Inbound 850 document was not translated due to an EDI defect. When multiple files came to the Mercator translator at virtually the same time, Mercator would assign the same Thread ID to each file. Once one of the files was processed, the other file with the same Thread ID was dropped as that Thread ID was marked as complete. This was a Mercator software defect; the fix was developed by the parent company, sent to the EDI group, and implemented the evening of 7/19/01.
071051FPEI001007	00	•	6/29/01 11:55	Inbound 850 document was not translated due to an EDI defect. When multiple files came to the Mercator translator at virtually the same time, Mercator would assign the same Thread ID to each file. Once one of the files was processed, the other file with the same Thread ID was dropped as that Thread ID was marked as complete. This was a Mercator software defect; the fix was developed by the parent company, sent to the EDI group, and implemented the evening of 7/19/01.
071051FPEI001008	00	l	6/29/01 11:55	Inbound 850 document was not translated due to an EDI defect. When multiple files came to the Mercator translator at virtually the same time, Mercator would assign the same Thread ID to each file. Once one of the files was processed, the other file with the same Thread ID was dropped as that Thread ID was marked as complete. This was a Mercator software defect; the fix was developed by the parent company, sent to the EDI group, and implemented the evening of 7/19/01.

PGN	VER	СС	Date Sent	BellSouth Findings
071051FPEI002002	00	7050	6/29/01 11:55	Inbound 850 document was not translated due to an EDI defect. When multiple files came to the Mercator translator at virtually the same time, Mercator would assign the same Thread ID to each file. Once one of the files was processed, the other file with the same Thread ID was dropped as that Thread ID was marked as complete. This was a Mercator software defect; the fix was developed by the parent company, sent to the EDI group, and implemented the evening of 7/19/01.
085011FPEH000009	02	9993	7/17/01 17:04	Disagree. This PON/VER was not received in EDI. We did, however, receive VER 00, 01, and 03 of this PON.
085011FPEH001001	02	9993	7/17/01 17:04	Disagree. This PON/VER was not received in EDI. We did, however, receive VER 00, 01, and 03 of this PON.

Additionally, KPMG Consulting continues to experience failure of a subsequent response, Error/Reject/Clarification or a Firm Order Confirmation after receipts of a Functional Acknowledgement.

The following communication log between KPMG Consulting and BellSouth's EC support detail EDI defects and the associated PON/VERs sent by KPMG Consulting that did not receive a subsequent response after receipt of an Acknowledgment:

PON	VER	CC	Date Sent	BellSouth EC Support Discovery (Ticket 56199)	BellSouth Findings
072131FPEH000003	00	9993		A defect in a downstream system is preventing a response document from being generated when a reject condition is encountered. Scheduled fixed on 07/27/01.	ConcurThis is as reported by EDI on EC Support Ticket 56199.  Defect fixed on 7/27/01.
072131FPEH000004	00	9993		A defect in a downstream system is preventing a response document from being generated when a reject condition is encountered. Scheduled fix on 07/27/01.	ConcurThis is as reported by EDI on EC Support Ticket 56199.  Defect fixed on 7/27/01.
072131FPEH000005	00	9993		A defect in a downstream system is preventing a response document from being generated when a reject condition is encountered. Scheduled fix on 07/27/01.	ConcurThis is as reported by EDI on EC Support Ticket 56199.  Defect fixed on 7/27/01.

PON	VER	cc	Date Sent	BellSouth EC Support Discovery (Ticket 56199)	BellSouth Findings
072131FPEH000006	00	9993	06/18/01 16:21	A defect in a downstream system is preventing a response document from being generated when a reject condition is encountered. Scheduled fixed on 07/27/01.	ConcurThis is as reported by EDI on EC Support Ticket 56199.  Defect fixed on 7/27/01.
072131FPEH000008	00	9993	06/19/01 16:11	A defect in a downstream system is preventing a response document from being generated when a reject condition is encountered. Scheduled fixed on 07/27/01.	ConcurThis is as reported by EDI on EC Support Ticket 56199.  Defect fixed on 7/27/01.
072141FPEH003001	00	9993	06/13/01 13:52	Clarification document was not generated due to an EDI defect. When multiple files came to the Mercator translator at virtually the same time, Mercator would assign the same Thread ID to each file. Once one of the files was processed, the other file with the same Thread ID was dropped as that Thread ID was marked as complete. This was a Mercator software defect; the fix was developed by the parent company, sent to the EDI group, and implemented the evening of 7/19/01.	ConcurThis is as reported by EDI on EC Support Ticket 56199.
072141FPEH003001	00	9993	06/21/01 9:39	A defect in a downstream system is preventing a response document from being generated when a reject condition is encountered. Scheduled fix on 07/27/01.	ConcurThis is as reported by EDI on EC Support Ticket 56199.  Defect fixed on 7/27/01.
084021FPEH000002	00	9993	06/7/01 14:55	Response transaction failed EDI translation due to a downstream defect where the ISA-PARTNER-ID was omitted. Scheduled fix on 6/22.	ConcurThis is as reported by EDI on EC Support Ticket 56199.  Defect fixed on 6/22/01.
084021FPEH000002	00	9993	06/21/01 11:23	A defect in a downstream system is preventing a response document from being generated when a reject condition is encountered. Scheduled fixed on 07/27/01.	ConcurThis is as reported by EDI on EC Support Ticket 56199.  Defect fixed on 7/27/01.

The PON/Vers listed below were submitted to BellSouth via the EDI interface and also failed to receive a subsequent response after receipt of an Acknowledgement:

PON	VER	СС	Date Sent	BellSouth Findings
002141FPEJ001006	00	9990	5/15/2001 11:36	Because of the age of this PON, CONNECT:Direct logs are unavailable to conclusively confirm our explanation for the missing response document. We presume that the response file that was transferred via CONNECT:Direct to EDI for translation and submission to KPMG was not processed due to an unusual CONNECT:Direct timing issue. When the CONNECT:Direct process encounters a significant delay (or failure), and the submitting application tries to rewrite to the receiving dataset, the file has been overwritten. This condition is being corrected in a release scheduled for 9/28/01.
002141FPEJ002006	00	9990	5/15/2001 11:40	Fell for manual handling on 5/15 @10:49. Was not worked by LCSC service representative because SUP (860) was received on 5/15 @12:50.
010011FPEN101003	00	9993	5/15/2001 11:44	Because of the age of this PON, CONNECT:Direct logs are unavailable to conclusively confirm our explanation for the missing response document. We presume that the response file that was transferred via CONNECT:Direct to EDI for translation and submission to KPMG was not processed due to an unusual CONNECT:Direct timing issue. When the CONNECT:Direct process encounters a significant delay (or failure), and the submitting application tries to rewrite to the receiving dataset, the file has been overwritten. This condition is being corrected in a release scheduled for 9/28/01.
002201FPEJ101003	00	9990	5/15/2001 11:52	Fell for manual handling on 5/15 @11:00. Was not worked by LCSC service representative because SUP (860) was received on 5/15 @12:56.
007061FPEJ102002	00	9990	5/15/2001 16:32	Because of the age of this PON, CONNECT:Direct logs are unavailable to conclusively confirm our explanation for the missing response document. We presume that the response file that was transferred via CONNECT:Direct to EDI for translation and submission to KPMG was not processed due to an unusual CONNECT:Direct timing issue. When the CONNECT:Direct process encounters a significant delay (or failure), and the submitting application tries to rewrite to the receiving dataset, the file has been overwritten. This condition is being corrected in a release scheduled for 9/28/01.

PON	VER	СС	Date Sent	BellSouth Findings
007061FPEJ102003	00	9991	5/15/2001 16:32	Because of the age of this PON, CONNECT:Direct logs are unavailable to conclusively confirm our explanation for the missing response document. We presume that the response file that was transferred via CONNECT:Direct to EDI for translation and submission to KPMG was not processed due to an unusual CONNECT:Direct timing issue. When the CONNECT:Direct process encounters a significant delay (or failure), and the submitting application tries to rewrite to the receiving dataset, the file has been overwritten. This condition is being corrected in a release scheduled for 9/28/01.
017031FPEN000002	00	9993	5/16/2001 9:17	Fell for manual handling on 5/16 @ 8:23. Was not worked by LCSC service representative because SUP (860) was received on 5/16 @ 8:25.
084021FPEH002001	00	9993	5/24/2001 14:03	The file from the downstream system was not received in EDI for translation due to a potential communication problem between the downstream system and EDI. Further analysis is being performed.
084011FPEH000004	00	9993	5/25/2001 11:57	The file from the downstream system was not received in EDI for translation due to a potential communication problem between the downstream system and EDI. Further analysis is being performed.
084011FPEH000005	00	9993	5/25/2001 12:06	The file from the downstream system was not received in EDI for translation due to a potential communication problem between the downstream system and EDI. Further analysis is being performed.
087041FPEH004001	00	9993	6/4/2001 18:33	A defect in a downstream system was preventing a response document from being generated when a reject condition was encountered. This was fixed on 07/27/01.
072011FPEH102001	00	9990	6/18/2001 14:26	Disagree. This PON/VER was not received in EDI. However, we did receive VER 01, which caused a reject document to be generated, indicating "No original LSR Found for this SUP."
054031FPEN000004	00	9993	6/21/2001 11:48	Disagree. This PON/VER was not received in EDI. We did, however, receive VER 00 of PON 054031FPEK000004 on 6/21 at 10:49

PON	VER	СС	Date Sent	BellSouth Findings
075012FPEF001002	00	9990	6/25/2001 11:15	Clarification document was not generated due to an EDI defect. When multiple files came to the Mercator translator at virtually the same time, Mercator would assign the same Thread ID to each file. Once one of the files was processed, the other file with the same Thread ID was dropped as that Thread ID was marked as complete. This was a Mercator software defect; the fix was developed by the parent company, sent to the EDI group, and implemented the evening of 7/19/01.
074052FPEH001002	02	9993	6/25/2001 17:23	Because of the age of this PON, CONNECT:Direct logs are unavailable to conclusively confirm our explanation for the missing response document. We presume that the response file that was transferred via CONNECT:Direct to EDI for translation and submission to KPMG was not processed due to an unusual CONNECT:Direct timing issue. When the CONNECT:Direct process encounters a significant delay (or failure), and the submitting application tries to rewrite to the receiving dataset, the file has been overwritten. This condition is being corrected in a release scheduled for 9/28/01.
011071FPEJ000009	00	9993	6/27/2001 9:24	Fell for manual handling on 6/27 @ 9:07. Was not worked by LCSC service representative because SUP (860) was received on 6/27 @ 9:36.
068021FPEI001001	00		6/27/2001 10:01	Disagree. This PON/VER was not received in EDI. We did, however, receive VER 00 of PON 068021FPEH001001 on 6/27 @ 9:01.
068021FPEI000004	00	7125	6/27/2001 10:25	Disagree. This PON/VER was not received in EDI. We did, however, receive VER 00 of PON 068021FPEH000004 on 6/27 @ 9:25.
068021FPEI000005	00		10:29	Disagree. This PON/VER was not received in EDI. We did, however, receive VER 00 of PON 068021FPEH000005 on 6/27 @ 9:29.
072141FPEH000002	00			A defect in a downstream system was preventing a response document from being generated when a reject condition was encountered. This was fixed on 07/27/01.
074021FPEF001002	01		11:17	Reject document was not generated due to an EDI defect. When multiple files came to the Mercator translator at virtually the same time, Mercator would assign the same Thread ID to each file. Once one of the files was processed, the other file with the same Thread ID was dropped as that Thread ID was marked as complete. This was a Mercator software defect; the fix was developed by the parent company, sent to the EDI group, and implemented the evening of 7/19/01.

PON	VER	СС	Date Sent	BellSouth Findings
084021FPEH000003	00	9993	6/27/2001 18:01	A defect in a downstream system was preventing a response document from being generated when a reject condition was encountered. This was fixed on 07/27/01.
087041FPEH000005	00	9993	7/3/2001 12:16	A defect in a downstream system was preventing a response document from being generated when a reject condition was encountered. This was fixed on 07/27/01.
093022FPEF001003	00	9990	7/12/2001 14:15	FOC document was not generated due to an EDI defect. When multiple files came to the Mercator translator at virtually the same time, Mercator would assign the same Thread ID to each file. Once one of the files was processed, the other file with the same Thread ID was dropped as that Thread ID was marked as complete. This was a Mercator software defect; the fix was developed by the parent company, sent to the EDI group, and implemented the evening of 7/19/01.
085011FPEH000009	03	9993	7/18/2001 11:29	A defect in a downstream system was preventing a response document from being generated when a reject condition was encountered. This was corrected on 07/27/01.
072141FPEH000002	01	9993	7/19/2001 10:47	A defect in a downstream system was preventing a response document from being generated when a reject condition was encountered. This was fixed on 07/27/01.

#### Impact:

Failure to respond to service requests via EDI could impact CLECs in the following ways:

**Decrease in Customer Satisfaction.** CLECs might experience unnecessary delays due to their inability to determine the status of their service requests. A delay in delivering a service to a customer may negatively impact a customer's perception of a CLEC's service quality.

**Increase in Operating Costs.** Researching problem resolutions may require additional CLEC resources before successfully processing individual customer orders.

#### BellSouth's Response:

All times shown are Central Standard Time. In addition to the explanations in the tables above, the reasons for the missing responses on these lists are summarized below:

- 1. List One -- For the 38 PONs rolled into Exception 105 from Observation 55 and 65:
  - 31 response documents failed EDI translation due to an X12 translation error. The EDI internal outbound map delimiter was changed from an asterisk to a hex character on 4/10/01 to correct this problem.

- 6 SUPs (860s) were received in EDI and translated but due to an EDI CONNECT: Direct problem they were not transmitted to downstream systems for processing. This was corrected on 3/26/01.
- 1 document was received in EDI, but failed to get processed downstream.
- 2. List Two -- For the first EC Support Ticket 56199 list containing PONs for which KPMG shows no Acknowledgments received, EDI had previously reported on subsequent response documents in that EC Support ticket. However, in response to this request regarding Acknowledgments:
  - BellSouth disagrees with KPMG findings on 1 PON. EDI records indicate that the FA for one of the listed PONs was sent to KPMG.
  - EDI records indicate that the first instance of one PON/VER was sent to KPMG, but that the second instance of the same PON/VER could have been impacted by the Mercator Translator Thread ID defect which was corrected on 7/19/01, but can't be verified.
  - 2 other FAs for PONs in this list could have been impacted by the Mercator Translator Thread ID defect which was corrected on 7/19/01, but can't be verified.
- 3. List Three For this list of PONs that KPMG records show that Acknowledgments were not received:
  - 6 inbound documents were affected by the Mercator EDI Thread ID defect which was corrected on 7/19/01. The inbound documents were not translated, therefore, the FA was not generated.
  - BellSouth disagrees with KPMG findings for 3 PONs. EDI records indicate that 3 PON/VERs were not received in the BellSouth systems.
- 4. List Four -- For the second EC Support Ticket 56199 list containing PONs for which KPMG shows receipt of FAs, but no subsequent response document were received:
  - Responses for 7 PONs were affected by the downstream system defect whereby reject documents were not being generated. This was corrected on 7/27/01.
  - 1 response document was not generated due to the Mercator EDI Thread ID defect which was corrected on 7/19/01.
  - 1 response document was not generated due to a downstream defect whereby omission of the ISA-PARTNER-ID caused EDI translation failure. This was corrected on 6/22/01.
- 5. List Five For this list of PONs that KPMG records show receipt of an FA, but no subsequent response documents:
  - Response documents for 5 PONs were impacted by a downstream system issue whereby a slowdown or failure in CONNECT:Direct contributed to a rewrite over the existing dataset, causing loss of data. This condition will be corrected on 9/28/01.
  - 4 PONs fell for manual handling and were SUP'd before a rep could claim them.
  - 3 PONs had response documents that failed due to a potential communication problem between a downstream system and EDI.

- 6 PONs were affected by the downstream system defect whereby reject documents were not being generated. This was corrected on 7/27/01.
- 3 response documents were not generated due to the Mercator EDI Thread ID defect which was corrected on 7/19/01.
- BellSouth disagrees with KPMG findings for 5 PONs. EDI records indicate that these 5 PON/VERs were not received in the BellSouth systems. EDI received a different VER for one of the five. Additionally, EDI records show receipt of similar PONs on the date/timestamp provided for the other 4.